

Remarks:

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office action dated February 15, 2006. Prior to entry of this response, claims 1-15 and 21-25 were pending in the application. In the Office action, Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwa et al. (US 6,624,952) in view of Tanide et al. (US 5,500,747); Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwa in view of Tanide and in further view of Cotton et al. (US 6,485,145); and Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwa et al. in view of Booth et al. (US 5,642,927) and Tanide et al. In addition, Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15 and 16 of copending Application No. 10/754,093 in view of Cotton et al.; and Claims 21-25 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15 and 16 of copending Application No. 10/754,093 in view of Booth et al. In view of the amendments above, and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the March 31, 2006, telephone interview. In the interview, the cited prior art was discussed, and agreement was reached regarding the patentability of proposed claims. In particular, it was agreed that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a display device that projects with a field angle of at least 100 degrees onto a substantially planar surface. As such, the claims are amended to reflect the scope discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that rejection of all pending claims be withdrawn.

Formal Matters

Applicant acknowledges the provisional rejection of claims 1-14 and 21-25 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting and is prepared to address that rejection if it matures.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)


Applicant respectfully traverses rejection of claims 1-15 and 21-25. However, to avoid delay in issuing the application, those claims are herein amended to reflect subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 on April 24, 2006.


Tracy Meeker

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP



Jason C. Creasman
Registration No. 51,587
Customer No. 50488
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)/Assignee
806 S.W. Broadway, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205
Telephone: (503) 459-4141
Facsimile: (503) 459-4142